

We're going to pick up on process questions under Next Steps. We'll talk about that tomorrow morning.

We want to make sure that we're organizing ourselves in a way that we meet our process concerns.

- Protect sage grouse as necessary and appropriate for the ESA
- Long term conservation/persistence
- Transparency
- Maximize legal defensibility
- Maximize scientific soundness
- Maintain relationships with federal, state, and Tribal partners
- Provide a clear rationale for decision making

Maintaining relationships with partners will not be the role of the SDM team. It will be completed by managers at various levels and will be aided by the communications staff that will be hired in the near term.

NOTES – Thursday, April 10, 2014

Alternatives

- Status (Threatened, Endangered, Not Warranted)
- DPS or not
- SPR or not

DPS

Any combination of the above (e.g. 3 DPSs, one with T, one E, one NW; 2 DPSs one T, one E; 1 DPS NW)

Clarification: Although the area in question is the majority of the greater sage-grouse range, it would more accurately described as the non-bi-state DPS.

4d and Critical Habitat

These are independent of the status determination, but will occur only for species that are listed. 4(d) only for Threatened species.

Process – DPS and Teams

We will need to propose decisions to decision makers. Suggested method for workload would be inform decision makers of framework, brief decisions for consideration.

Concerns and Objectives

- Efficient/ Streamlined process
- Record Clarity
- Voices heard in FWS
- Clarity of Communication